

~~The film was rerun a number of times.~~

Deposition of Dean Adams Andrews, Jr., a New Orleans attorney, July 21, 1964, questioning by Wesley J. Liebeler, Assistant Counsel, Warren Commission. Pages 11H325-339. Liebeler asked Andrews to describe an occasion in the summer of 1963 when, he had said to the FBI, Oswald had come to his office.

"Mr. Andrews. I don't recall the dates, but briefly, it is this: Oswald came in the office accompanied by some gay kids. They were Mexicanos. He wanted to find out what could be done in connection with a discharge, a yellow paper discharge, so I explained to him he would have to advance the funds to transcribe whatever records they had up in the Adjutant General's office. When he brought the money, I would do the work, and we saw him three or four times subsequent to that, not in the company of the gay kids. He had this Mexicano with him. I assume he is a Mex because the Latins do not wear a butch haircut.

"Mr. Liebeler. The first time he came in he was with these Mexicans, and there were also some gay kids. By that, of course, you mean people that appeared to you to be homosexuals?

"Mr. Andrews. Well, they swish. What they are, I don't know. We call them gay kids.

"Mr. Liebeler. ~~Had~~ Had you ever seen any of those kids before?

"Mr. Andrews. None of them.

"Mr. Liebeler. Have you seen any of them since?

"Mr. Andrews. Since the first time they came in?

"Mr. Liebeler. Since the first time they came in?

"Mr. Andrews. Yes.

"Mr. Liebeler. You have?

"Mr. Andrews. Yes.

MR. ~~ANDREWS~~ LIEBELER. Did they ever come back with Oswald?

MR. ANDREWS. No Mexicanos came back.

MR. LIEBELER. Where did you see these gay kids after the first time?

MR. ANDREWS. First district precinct. Police picked them up for wearing clothes of the opposite sex.

MR. LIEBELER. How many of them were there?

MR. ANDREWS. About 50.

MR. LIEBELER. They weren't all with Oswald, were they?

MR. ANDREWS. No; Oswald--you see, they made what they call a scoop and put them all in the pokey. I went down for the ones I represented. They were in the holding pavilion. I paroled them and got them out.

MR. LIEBELER. You do represent from time to time some of these gay kids, is that correct?

MR. ANDREWS. Yes.

MR. LIEBELER. You say that some of the gay kids that you saw at the time the police arrested this large group of them for wearing clothes of the opposite sex were the ones that had been with Oswald?" (p.326)

Andrews also said he saw Oswald giving out leaflets in front of the building in which Andrews has his office (p.328). On the same page describing the pamphlets Andrews said "They have a lot of guys, Mexicanos and Cubanos, that will tear your head off if they see you ~~for~~ fooling with these things." meaning pro-Castro literature. When shown "Bringuier Exhibit No. 1" (p. 329) and asked if he recognized anyone he identified Oswald "a client of mine is over here". He also said that a dress in the picture "belongs to a girl friend."

He also identifies Oswald in the picture as the man who had come to his office. When Liebefer started a line of questioning about the Mexican on page 330 he got a lengthy dissertation on the impossibility of Oswald having killed the President.

"MR LIEBERER. Would you recognize this Mexican again if you saw him?

MR. ANDREWS. Yes.

MR. LIEBELER. Do you remember telling the FBI that you wouldn't be able to recognize him again if you saw ~~him~~ him?

MR. ANDREWS. Probably did. Been a long time. There's three people I am going to find: One of them is the real guy that killed the President; the Mexican; and Clay Bertrand.

MR. LIEBELER. Do you mean to suggest by that statement that you have considerable doubt in your mind that Oswald killed the President?

MR. ANDREWS. I know good and well he did not. With that weapon, he couldn't have been capable of making three controlled shots in that short time.

MR. LIEBELER. You are basing your opinion on reports that you have received over news media as to how many shots were fired in what period of time; is that correct?

MR. ANDREWS. I am basing my opinion on five years as an ordnanceman in the Navy. You can lean into those things, and with throwing the bolts--if I couldn't do it myself, 8 hours a day, doing this for a living, constantly on the range, I know this civilian couldn't do it. He might have been a sharp marksman at one time, but if you don't lean into that rifle and don't squeeze and control consistently, your brain can tell you how to do it, but

you don't have the capability.

MR. LIEBELER. You have used a pronoun in this last series of statements, the pronoun 'it'. If You are making certain assumptions as to what actually happened, or you have a certain notion in your mind as to what happened based on material you read in the newspaper?

MR. ANDREWS. It doesn't make any difference. What you have to do is lean into a weapon, and, to fire three shots controlled with accuracy, this boy couldn't do it. Forget the President.

*can. ant can. Wesley J. asked*  
MR. LIEBELER. You base that judgment on the fact that, in your own experience, it is difficult to do that sort of thing?

*And thus declared,*  
MR. ANDREWS. You have to stay with it. You just don't pick up a rifle or a pistol or whatever weapon you are using and stay proficient with it. You have to know what you are doing. You have to be a conniver. This boy could have connived the deal, but I think he is a patsy. ~~B~~ Somebody else pulled the trigger.

MR. LIEBELER. However, as we have indicated, it is your opinion. You don't have any evidence other than what you have already told us about your surmise and opinions about the rifle on which to base that statement; is that correct? If you do, I want to know what it is.

MR. ANDREWS. If I did, I would give it to you. It's just taking the 5 years and thinking about it a bit. I have fired as much as 40,000 rounds of ammo a day for 7 days a week. You get pretty good with it as long as you keep firing. Then I have gone back after 2 weeks. I used to be able to take a shotgun, go on a skeet, and pop 100 out of 100. After 2 weeks, I could only pop 60 of them. I would have to start shooting again, same way with the rifle and machineguns. Every other person I knew, same thing

happened to them. You just have to stay at it."

Andrews testimony on page 331 indicates that he has tried to locate the Mexicans since then.

"MR. LIEBELER. And you have never seen the Mexican at any other time since then?

MR. ANDREWS. No. He just couldn't have disappeared because the Mexican community here is pretty small. You can squeeze it pretty good, the Latin community. He is not known around here.

MR. LIEBELER. Have you made an attempt to find him since the assassination?

MR. ANDREWS. Yes.

MR. LIEBELER. And you haven't had any success?

MR. ANDREWS. No. Not too many places they can go not being noticed."

Andrews had been served a subpoena duces tecum. He explained lack of records by saying "My office was rifled shortly after I got out of the hospital, and I talked with the FBI people. We couldn't find anything prior to it. Whoever was kind enough to mess my office up, going through it, we haven't found anything since." This rifling of the office is not discussed nor are any questions asked about it, such as whether or not it had been reported to the police and if it had whether the police had a report of any kind on it.

Still on the same page Andrews is asked "When you had some further involvement with Oswald..." and he replies "No; nothing at all with Oswald...a voice I recognized as Clay Bertrand asked me if I would go to Dallas and Houston--I think--Dallas, I guess, wherever it was that this boy was being held--and defend him. ~~I~~ I told him

I was sick in the hospital. If I couldn't go, I would find somebody that could go." Farther down on page 331 Andrews described<sup>s</sup> Bertrand as one who frequently called him "in behalf of gay kids normally, either to obtain bond or parole for them. I would assume that he was the one that originally sent Oswald and the gay kids, these Mexicanos, to the office because I had never seen those people before at all."

Usually he heard from Bertrand by phone. He places the date of the telephone call seeking representation for Oswald in Dallas as a Friday or a Saturday. And explains his uncertainty by saying "...they told me I was squirrely in the hospital." He had pneumonia and in Liebler's words "...As as I understand it, you were under heavy sedation at that time in connection with your treatment for pneumonia?"

He called his secretary about this and his account of the time and hers were in accord. (p. 332)

Hewas spoken to by an FBI agent and presumably a Secret Service agent on November 25. (p.333). On the following page it appears that Andrews originally called the FBI.

When again asked about Bertrand he said "Oh, I ran up on that rat about 6 weeks ago and he spooked, ran in the street. I would have beat him with a chain if I had caught him." Atthe bottom of this page (334) he reiterates "what I wanted to do and should have done is crack him in the head with a bottle, but I figured I would be a good, law-abiding citizen and call them (FBI) and let them grab him, but I made the biggest mistake of the century. I should have grabbed him right there. I probably will never find him again. He has been bugging me ever since this happened." On page 335 he

says that his private detective, Preston Davis, recalls his discussion with Davis of the Oswald visit but that his secretary does not. Apparently Mr. Andrews has a considerable amount of business with those he describes as "gay kids" for on page <sup>336</sup>~~328~~ when asked he said "Well, let's see. Last week there were six of them in there. Depends on how bad the police are rousing them. They shoo them in. My best customers are the police. They shoo them into the office. God bless the police."

A further description of his impression of Bertrand appears on page 337 where he said "His connections with Oswald I don't know at all. I think he is a lawyer without a brief case. That's my opinion." Bertrand's <sup>f</sup>flight he said could be attributed/ <sup>either</sup>to the fact that Bertrand owed Andrews money or "he could be running because they have been squeezing the quarter pretty good looking for him while I was in the hospital, and somebody might have passed the word he was hot and I was looking for him..." When Andrews couldn't go to Dallas because of illness "...I called Monk Zelden... and asked Monk if he would go over...I thought I called Monk once. Monk says we talked twice..." The Andrews manner of distinguishing between Latin Americans is briefly described on page 338 "Mexicanos will crop their hair and a Latin won't, so I assume he is a Mex." Liebeler at one point (p. 339) told Andrews "Well, your friends down the street have been trying to find him (referring to one of the men) and haven't come up with him yet." Andrews asked "Debrueys?" When Liebeler said "Yes" Andrews rejoined "Sometimes the stools on that are not too good. They need Latin stools for that boy." Off the record discussion followed.

Because I seem to recall from somewhere an inference that Andrews

took dope I checked the report. The index referred to page 326. This is an error. It is page 325. At this point the Commission says ~~Notes~~ it "noted" Andrews' testimony. The Commission also said "Andrews was able to locate no records of any of Oswald's alleged visits, and investigation has failed to locate the person who supposedly called Andrews on November 23, at a time when Andrews was under heavy sedation. While one of Andrews' employees felt that Oswald might have been at his office, his secretary has no recollection of Oswald being there."

Note there is no reference to the rifling of Andrews' office which, unless it is false, certainly accounts for the lack of any records. Note also that the version of Preston Davis's recollection is not in conformity with the testimony of Andrews and the index of witnesses does not indicate that the Commission has taken testimony its agents have taken a deposition or that they have an affidavit from Mr. Davis. Unless the Commission is drawing on information not in the testimony of various kinds it is not fairly representing the information on 11H335 where Andrews specifically stated "Davis does" in response to a question whether Davis or the secretary recalled Oswald being in his office. A note on the bias and fairness of the Commission: Each of the 26 volumes begins with the briefest preface indicating the general nature of the testimony included. In the preface to volume 11 dealing with the testimony of Andrews, Mrs. Odio and others, the Commission uses this description "who testified concerning contacts they believed they had with Oswald in New Orleans and Dallas under various circumstances". This doesn't say anything to anyone who is looking for information in the preface. It is hardly a fair representation of the testimony in any event.



The ~~important~~ of these depositions is exceedingly serious. It raises the most serious and substantial kind of questions, for example, about the possibility of conspiracies. If this can be called a description it is so subdued and so played down as to constitute a kind of deception.